



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Deb

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,187	08/31/2001	Ken Ostrom	35706.2300	8503
34398	7590	05/10/2005	EXAMINER	
PRIMARION 2507 WEST GENEVA DRIVE TEMPE, AZ 85282			PATEL, RAJNIKANT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2838	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/945,187	OSTROM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rajnikant B. Patel	2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-45 and 52-54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 13-45 and 52-54 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/01 and 7/02.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 13,30-45 and 52-54 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of copending Application No. 10/147,156 (Tang et al.) in view of Roberts et al. (U.S. patent # 6,392,612) (teaches positive and negative transient control) and George (U.S. Patent # 6,392,612) (teaches sense and sink circuit). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both set of claims claiming same subject matters "to detecting transient power and regulating transient power. Claiming same subject matters by different wordings.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

3. Claims 13-45 and 52-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,504. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both set of claims are drawn to the same subject matters regulating transient by utilizing plurality or dual regulators with sourcing current and sinking current.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Every (U.S. Patent # 5,959,372) in combination with Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,166,850) and George (U.S. Patent # 6,392,612).

Every disclose claimed invention a power regulator (figure 1-10), transient power demand (column 1, line 50-60), a transient response (column 1, line 30-50). However Every does not disclose the utilization of the technique for a controlling positive and negative transient, a sense circuit, and a sink circuit. Roberts et al. teaches the utilization of the similar technique for a for a controlling positive and negative transient (column 6, line column 5, line 50-70 and column 6, line 1-68) and George teaches the

utilization of the technique for a sense circuit, and a sink circuit (Abstract, line 1-15). It would have been obvious one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Every power management circuit by utilizing the technique taught by Roberts et al. and George for the purpose improve the efficiency of the power supply circuit. Further a metal oxide semiconductor devices (Every - figure 5, item 212 and 215a), a bipolar device (figure 5, item 630), the bandwidth of the amplifier (Roberts et al.'s abstract line 1-5), transient events that are faster (Roberts et al.' column 9, line 35-50).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rajnikant B. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2082. The examiner can normally be reached on 6.30-5.00; m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Micheal Sherry can be reached on 571-272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rajnikant B. Patel
RAJNIKANT B. PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Av. 2838